

### **REMARKS**

Claims 8, 10, 12-14, 16-22, 25-33, 38-65 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-8, 10-11, 13-14, 16-19, 34, 36-37, 47-53, and 63-66 stand rejected. Claims 12 and 38-46 are objected to. Claims 9, 15, 23, 24 and 35 have been previously cancelled, and Claims 1-7, 11, 34-37 and have been cancelled herein. Claims 8, 12-14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 38-48, 50-53, 63 and 65 have been amended herein. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application, drawings and claims as originally filed and, as such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained therein.

### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Applicants gratefully appreciate the allowance of Claims 20-22, 25-33 and 54-62.

The Examiner further states that Claims 12 and 38-46 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter. In order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended Claims 12 and 38 to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have also amended Claims 63 and 65 to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 12. Therefore, Claims 12, 38, 63 and 65 should now be in condition for allowance, along with Claims 8, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 39-53 and 64 that depend from either independent Claims 12, 38, or 63.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 34, 36, 37, 50, 51, 63 and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Harris (U.S. Pat. No. 4,443,850; hereinafter "Harris"). Claims 1-3, 34, 36, 37, 50, 51, 63, 64 and 66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Burrus, Jr. et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,837,677; hereinafter "Burrus"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As Claims 1-3, 34, 36, 37 and 66 have been cancelled, the rejection to these claims has been rendered moot. With regard to Claims 63 and 65, as discussed above, these claims have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 12, and thus, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 63 and 65 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Further, as Claims 50, 51 and 64 depend directly from now allowable Claims 38 and 63, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 4-6 and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrus as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of The Free On-Line Dictionary of Computing ("FOLDOC"). Claims 7, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris. Claims 7, 10, 11, 13 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrus. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrus as

applied to Claim 7 above, and further in view of FOLDOC. Claims 14, 48 and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrus as applied to Claims 7 and 36 above, and further in view of Blixt et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,938,118; hereinafter "Blixt"). Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrus as applied to Claim 7 above, and further in view of Applicants' Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA"). Claim 53 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrus as applied to Claim 36 above, and further in view of Smith et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,222,537; hereinafter "Smith"). Claim 64 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrus as applied to Claim 63 above, and further in view of Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, Second Edition ("Microsoft"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As Claims 4-6, 7 and 11 have been cancelled, the rejection to these claims has been rendered moot. With regard to Claims 8, 10, 13, 14, 16-19, 48, 49, 52, 53 and 64, as Claims 8, 10, 13, 14, 16-19, 48, 49, 52, 53 and 64 depend from now allowable Claims 12, 38 and 63, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).


#### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4/25/07

By:   
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686  
Erica K. Schaefer, Reg. No. 55,861

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/chs